

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01868 01 OF 04 042153Z

70

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00

NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 NEA-10

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 ACDA-19 AEC-11 OMB-01 NIC-01 EB-11

DRC-01 /155 W

----- 089355

P R 041900Z APR 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 5026

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 4 USNATO 1868

E.O. 11652: GDS 12-31-80

TAGS: MCAP, NATO

SUBJECT: DRC DISCUSSION OF COVER NOTE FOR 1975-1980

DRAFT FORCE GOALS

IS CIRCULATED FIRST DRAFT OF GENERAL COVER NOTE FOR DRC REPORT
ON EXAMINATION OF FORCE PROPOSALS. DRC CHAIRMAN HUMPHRESY
INTENDS TO TABLE DRAFT FOR DRC DISCUSSION OF FORMAT AND SCOPE
DURING APRIL 5 MEETING. TEXT FOLLOWS:

BEGIN TEXT:

DRAFT FORCE GOALS FOR 1975-1980

DRAFT OF REPORT BY THE DEFENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

N.B. THIS REPORT IS INTENDED TO BE READ IN CONJUNCTION
WITH THE REPORT BY THE MILITARY COMMITTEE (MCM-14-74)

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01868 01 OF 04 042153Z

INTRODUCTION

THE PROCEDURES (1) FOR THE NATO DEFENCE PLANNING REVIEW
REQUIRE THE DEFENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE, ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE

DEFENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE, TO EXAMINE THE FORCE PROPOSALS AS SUBMITTED BY THE MILITARY COMMITTEE, FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THEIR POLITICAL, FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY AND THEIR COMPATIBILITY WITH THE LIMITS IMPOSED BY THE MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE GOVERNING THEIR PREPARATION. THE DEFENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE IS EXPECTED TO MAKE ITS RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DEFENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE IN THE FORM OF DRAFT FORCE GOALS, AT THE SAME TIME STATING THE REASONS FOR ANY CHANGES FROM THE MILITARY COMMITTEE'S FORCE PROPOSALS.

2. THE AIM OF THE FORCE GOALS IS NOT TO TAILOR MILITARY PROPOSALS TO A SIMPLE PROJECTION OF KNOW COUNTRY PLANS; THEY SHOULD STRIKE A BALANCE BETWEEN MILITARY REQUIREMENTS, AVAILABLE RESOURCES AND POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS. THEY SHOULD REPRESENT A DESIRABLE OBJECTIVE OF COORDINATED NATO FORCE PLANNING, AND PRESENT COUNTRIES WITH A REASONABLE CHALLENGE IN THE ALLOCATION AND EFFECTIVE APPLICATION OF RESOURCES. THEY SHOULD TAKE ACCOUNT AS FAR AS POSSIBLE OF THE AGREED CONCLUSIONS OF RELEVANT STUDIES. THEY SHOULD NOT, HOWEVER, BE REGARDED AS FINAL AND INFLEXIBLE, BUT SUBJECT TO REVISION SHOULD CIRCUMSTANCES SO REQUIRE.

(1) DPC/D(71)10, 19TH MAY, 1971

3. THE DEFENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE HAS NOW COMPLETED ITS EXAMINATION OF THE FORCE PROPOSALS OF THE MAJOR NATO COMMANDERS(1) AS THEY HAVE EMERGED AFTER CONSIDERATION BY THE MILITARY COMMITTEE(2). THIS EXAMINATION HAS BEEN CONDUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OBJECTIVES SET OUT ABOVE, AND IN THE LIGHT OF THE EXCHANGE OF CORRESPONDANCE BETWEEN THE SECRETARY GENERAL AND THE UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR(3), WHICH CALLED IN PARTICULAR FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF NO-COST OR LOW-COST MEASURES AND THOSE WHICH PROVIDE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR COOPERATION AND JOINT PROCUREMENT. OUR REPORTS ON THE FORCE PROPOSAL FOR EACH COUNTRY AND THE DRAFT FORCE GOALS WHICH WE RECOMMEND HAVE BEEN CIRCULATED SEPARATELY, TOGETHER WITH THE REASONS FOR THE CHANGES
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01868 01 OF 04 042153Z

WE BELIEVE NECESSARY(4). THIS REPORT DEALS WITH THE FORCE GOALS AS A WHOLE. ITS SCOPE IS AS FOLLOWS:

- (A) THE APPROACH AND METHODS WE HAVE ADOPTED;
- (B) COMPATIBILITY WITH THE MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE;
- (C) FEASIBILITY;
- (D) RELEVANCE OF OTHER STUDIES;
- (E) ASSOCIATED RISKS;
- (F) CONCLUSIONS.

(1) SACEUR: BASIC DOCUMENT: 1240.5/20-2-3/S8/73, 31ST OCTOBER 1973
PROPOSALS BY COUNTRY: 1240.5/20-2-3/S37/73-S49/73

DETAILED COSTINGS: 1240.5/20-2-3/S50/73-S62/73
SACLANT:C-3121/3062 SER: N-1217, 4TH OCTOBER, 1973
CINCHAN:CHEL.3460/12P, 24TH OCTOBER, 1973
(2) MCM-14-74, 18TH FEBRUARY, 1974
(3) -
(4) DPC/D(74)5, .. APRIL, 1974: COUNTRY SERIES

APPROACH AND METHOD

4. OUR STARTING POINT WAS A SET OF FORCE PROPOSALS WHICH HAD BEEN DISCUSSED BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MAJOR NATO COMMANDERS WITH AT LEAST THE MILITARY AUTHORITIES IN THE CAPITALS CONCERNED LAST YEAR. WE ASSUMED THAT THE MOST OBVIOUSLY UNREALISTIC PROPOSALS WOULD HAVE BEEN ELIMINATED DURING THIS PROCESS.

THESE PROPOSALS HAD BEEN EXAMINED BY THE MILITARY COMMITTEE FROM THE ALLIANCE WIDE MILITARY POINT OF VIEW, AND WERE FORWARDED AS GUIDELINES FOR A BALANCED FORCE STRUCTURE OVER THE PLANNING PERIOD, THE ADOPTION OF WHICH WOULD STILL INVOLVE CERTAIN RISKS. WE DISCOVERED DURING THE COURSE OF OUR EXAMINATION, HOWEVER, THAT THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF PROPOSALS HAD NOT ALWAYS BEEN CLEARLY ESTABLISHED, AND THAT OVERLANDS AND CONFLICTING CLAIMS HAD NOT IN ALL CASES BEEN ELIMINATED OR RECONCILED. WE HAVE THEREFORE DEALT WITH THE TOTALITY OF THESE PROPOSALS, WITHOUT MAKING ANY JUDGMENT ON THE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES BETWEEN MAJOR NATO COMMANDERS. WE ALSO HAD AVAILABLE TO US PROJECTIONS MADE BY THE ECONOMIC DIRECTORATE OF THE ADDITIONAL RESOURCES WHICH WOULD
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 01868 01 OF 04 042153Z

BECOME AVAILABLE FOR DEFENCE IN EACH COUNTRY OVER THE PERIOD IN ACCORDANCE WITH VARYING ASSUMPTIONS AS TO THE GROWTH RATE IN THE ECONOMY AS A WHOLE AND THE PERCENTAGE OF THE GNP ALLOTTED TO DEFENCE. FINALLY WE HAD A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF DATA ON THE COST IMPLICATIONS OF VARIOUS PROPOSALS; IN SOME CASES THIS WAS SUPPLIED BY THE COUNTRY CONCERNED, IN OTHERS IT WAS ASSESSED BY THE MAJOR NATO COMMANDER OR THE INTERNATIONAL STAFF, BUT IN MANY INSTANCES IT WAS NON-EXISTENT.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 01868 02 OF 04 042214Z

70
ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00

NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 NEA-10

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 ACDA-19 AEC-11 OMB-01 NIC-01 EB-11

DRC-01 /155 W

----- 089750

P R 041900Z APR 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 5027

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 4 USNATO 1868

5. OUR APPROACH WAS TO IDENTIFY AS FAR AS POSSIBLE THE FORCE PROPOSALS WHICH WERE ALREADY INCLUDED IN NATIONAL PLANS (OR IN A NATIONAL PROJECTION OF KNOWN PLANS UP TO 1980) AND TO SEPARATE THOSE WHICH ACTUALLY REPRESENT A CALL FOR EXTRA EFFORT. THEN ON THE BASIS OF THE ECONOMIC ASSESSMENTS AVAILABLE WE ESTABLISHED AN UPPER AND LOWER LIMIT TO THE ADDITIONAL RESOURCES ASSUMED TO BE AVAILABLE FOR DEFENCE OVER THE PERIOD, AND COMPARED THIS WITH OUR OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE TOTAL EXTRA EFFORT REQUIRED BY THE FORCE PROPOSALS. THIS ENABLED US TO TAKE AN INITIAL VIEW OF THE DEGREE OF SELECTIVITY REQUIRED IN OUR EXAMINATION. WE THEN CONSIDERED EACH INDIVIDUAL FORCE PROPOSAL ON ITS MERITS, ELIMINATING THOSE WHICH ON ANY REASONABLE ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS ARE BEYOND THE CAPABILITY OF THE COUNTRY TO IMPLEMENT, OR THE COST OF WHICH WAS CLEARLY DISPROPORTIONATE TO THE MILITARY PRIORITY ATTACHED TO THEM. WE ALSO FELT IT NECESSARY TO ELIMINATE A NUMBER OF FORCE PROPOSALS FOR TECHNICAL REASONS OR BECAUSE THEY WERE IMPOSSIBLE TO ACHIEVE WITHIN THE TIME-SCALE. IN A LARGE NUMBER OF CASES, HOWEVER, OUR EXAMINATION LED US TO RECOMMEND AMENDMENTS TO THE CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01868 02 OF 04 042214Z

SCALE, TIMING OR NATURE OF THE PROPOSAL WHICH IN THE VIEW OF THE COMMITTEE WOULD BRING THEM WITHIN THE FIELD OF ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY.

6. IN A FURTHER ROUND OF DISCUSSION ON EACH COUNTRY, WE WERE ABLE TO COMPARE THE TOTALITY OF THE REVISED FORCE PROPOSALS, AS THEY EMERGED FROM OUR FIRST EXAMINATION, WITH A MORE CONSIDERED VIEW OF THE RESOURCES AVAILABLE. THIS ENABLED US TO FURTHER REFINE AND ADJUST OUR RECOMMENDED FORCE GOALS SO AS TO PRESENT A 'REASONABLE CHALLENGE' TO THE COUNTRY CONCERNED. IT ALSO ENABLED US TO IDENTIFY THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE PROPOSALS ADDRESSED TO DIFFERENT COUNTRIES, TO STRIKE A FAIR BALANCE BETWEEN THEM, AND TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE VIEWS OF THE MILITARY AUTHORITIES, AS EXPRESSED THROUGH THEIR REPRESENTATIVES, ON THE REVISED FORCE PLANS IMPLIED THEREBY.

7. IN ONLY FOUR CASES (CANADA, GERMANY, LUXEMBOURG AND THE UNITED STATES) DID WE CONCLUDE THAT ALL THE FORCE PROPOSALS WERE

WITHIN THE ECONOMIC CAPABILITY OF THE COUNTRY CONCERNED. IN THREE OTHERS (GREECE, TURKEY AND PORTUGAL) WE HAVE THOUGHT IT DESIRABLE TO RECOMMEND SEPARATELY THOSE PROPOSALS WHICH WE BELIEVE THE COUNTRY CAN IMPLEMENT FROM ITS OWN RESOURCES, AND THOSE FOR WHICH THE COUNTRY MUST LOOK TO EXTERNAL AID, AND WHICH CANNOT BE ELIMINATED FOR OTHER REASONS.

8. THE APPROACH WE HAVE ADOPTED, THOUGH NECESSARILY SUBJECTIVE, IS BASED ON A SUBSTRUCTURE OF FACT AND ANALYSIS. IT IS FLEXIBLE ENOUGH TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE DIFFERING CONDITIONS (MILITARY, ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL) IN EACH COUNTRY. THE OUTCOME REFLECTS A COLLECTIVE VIEW ON THE REALISTIC TARGETS WHICH EACH COUNTRY SHOULD BE ASKED TO ADOPT FOR PLANNING ITS MILITARY CONTRIBUTION TO NATO.

COMPATIBILITY WITH THE MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE:

9. THE MILITARY COMMITTEE HAVE CONCLUDED(1) THAT THEIR RECOMMENDED FORCE PROPOSALS ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE(2), WHICH PLACED PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON THE READINESS OF FORCES, FORCES READY AND AVAILABLE IN OR NEAR THEIR BATTLE POSITIONS IN PEACETIME, THOSE WHICH CAN BE EFFECTIVELY DEPLOYED DURING THE POSSIBLE WARNING TIME, CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01868 02 OF 04 042214Z

AND THOSE WHICH COULD BE EMPLOYED SO AS TO AFFECT THE INITIAL STAGES OF HOSTILITIES. MINISTERS ALSO ATTACHED IMPORTANCE TO FORCES WHICH CAN BE USED FOR POLITICAL EFFECT AND TO DEMONSTRATE THE COHESIVENESS OF THE ALLIANCE, AND TO THE MAINTENANCE OF AN EFFECTIVE CAPABILITY FOR THE TACTICAL USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS FOR DETERRENT EFFECT. THEY INVITED THE MILITARY AUTHORITIES(3) TO ESTABLISH A RIGOROUS SYSTEM OF PRIORITIES TO ENSURE THAT ADDITIONAL RESOURCES BECOMING AVAILABLE FOR DEFENCE ARE DEVOTED PRIMARILY TO

(A) CAPABILITIES WHICH CONTRIBUTE DIRECTLY TO DETERRENCE;

(B) CAPABILITIES WHICH CAN BE DEPLOYED RAPIDLY

WITHIN THE POSSIBLE PERIOD OF WARNING TIME

OR TO AFFECT THE INITIAL STAGES OF HOSTILITIES;

(C) MEASURES WHICH IMPROVE THE QUALITY OR READINESS

OF FORCES AVAILABLE FOR EARLY USE.

THE COMPATIBILITY OF THE FORCE PROPOSALS WITH THE MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE ON THE AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES IS DEALT WITH BELOW.

(1) ENCLOSURE TO MCM-14-74, PARAGRAPH 3

(2) DPC/D(73)8, PARAGRAPHS 22 TO 24

(3) DPC/D(73)8, PARAGRAPH 35

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 01868 03 OF 04 042235Z

70

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00

NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 NEA-10

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 ACDA-19 AEC-11 OMB-01 NIC-01 EB-11

DRC-01 /155 W

----- 090018

P R 041900Z APR 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 5028

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 3 OF 4 USNATO 1868

FEASIBILITY

10. MINISTERS INSTRUCTED (4) THE MILITARY AUTHORITIES TO BASE THEIR FORCE PROPOSALS ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT 'ALL COUNTRIES WILL DEVOTE TO DEFENCE PURPOSES, WHERE THIS IS WITHIN THEIR ECONOMIC CAPABILITY, A STABLE AND POSSIBLE LARGE PROPORTION OF THEIR GROWING NATIONAL WEALTH. IN FACT THE PROJECTIONS OF COUNTRY PLANS SUBMITTED IN REPLY TO THE DEFENCE PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE ONLY A FEW MONTHS LATER INDICATED THAT ALMOST WITHOUT EXCEPTION ALL COUNTRIES WERE BASING THEIR FORCE PLANS FOR THE PERIOD UP TO 1978 ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT DEFENCE WOULD BE ALLOTTED A PROGRESSIVELY DECREASING PERCENTAGE OF THE GNP; THIS REINFORCES THE TREND IDENTIFIABLE IN NATIONAL PROGRAMMES OVER THE LAST DECADE,

AND IMPLIES A CONSCIOUS DECISION TO REALLOCATE INCREASING RESOURCES AWAY FROM DEFENCE.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01868 03 OF 04 042235Z

(4) DPC/D(73)8, PARAGRAPH 32

11. THE COMMITTEE HAD THEREFORE TO TAKE A VIEW ON TWO RELATED QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO EACH COUNTRY:

(A) THE PROJECTED RATE OF ECONOMIC GROWTH OVER THE PERIOD. HERE WE BASED OURSELVES ON THE LATEST OECD PROJECTIONS. WE FELT IT NECESSARY TO QUALIFY THESE, HOWEVER, BY REFERENCE TO THE EFFECTS OF THE CURRENT OIL CRISIS, THOUGH IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO PREDICT HOW FAR THESE WILL EXTEND THROUGHOUT THE PERIOD, AND NOT EVERY COUNTRY IS AFFECTED TO THE SAME EXTENT. WE FELT IT NECESSARY TO POSTULATE AN ALTERNATIVE, MORE PESSIMISTIC PROJECTED GROWTH RATE FOR EACH COUNTRY TO ESTABLISH A RANGE OF POSSIBILITIES.

(B) THE PERCENTAGE OF GNP WHICH EACH COUNTRY MIGHT REASONABLY BE ASKED TO ALLOCATE TO DEFENCE. HERE AGAIN A DIFFERENTIAL APPROACH WAS ADOPTED. FOR COUNTRIES WHICH ALREADY DEVOTE A PERCENTAGE OF GNP ABOVE THE EUROPEAN AVERAGE OF 4.2, WE FELT THAT IT WAS REALISTIC TO EXPECT THEM TO MAINTAIN THEIR CONTRIBUTION AT, OR SLIGHTLY BELOW THIS FIGURE. FOR THOSE BELOW THE AVERAGE WE FELT IT NOT UNREASONABLE TO ASSUME THAT THEIR DEFENCE PERCENTAGE OF GNP COULD BE BROUGHT CLOSER TO THE AVERAGE, PARTICULARLY IN THOSE CASES WHERE THE PER CAPITA INCOME IS HIGH AND THE PROJECTED GROWTH RATE IS ALSO HEALTHY.

12. WE HAVE RECOMMENDED THE ELIMINATION OR AMENDMENT OF A NUMBER OF FORCE PROPOSALS ON GROUNDS OTHER THAN ECONOMIC (E.G. TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY OR COST-EFFECTIVENESS). THOSE WHICH REMAIN ARE IN OUR UNANIMOUS VIEW ECONOMICALLY FEASIBLE.

13. WE HAVE LISTED SEPARATELY IN OUR REPORT ON EACH COUNTRY THOSE FORCE PROPOSALS WHERE COST IS NOT A LIMITING FACTOR.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01868 03 OF 04 042235Z

RELEVANCE OF OTHER STUDIES

14. THE MILITARY COMMITTEE HAVE STATED(1) THAT THEY ARE SATISFIED THAT THE THRUST OF THE AD 70 RECOMMENDATIONS IS FULLY REFLECTED IN THE FORCE PROPOSALS: THEY NOTE THAT AT LEAST 85 PER CENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER ARE CLEARLY IN SUPPORT OF THE AD 70 PROGRAM FOR IMPROVING THE SURVIVABILITY AND COMBAT EFFECTIVENESS OF NATO FORCES. THEY ALSO POINT OUT THAT THE PROPOSALS REGARDING AIRFIELD PROTECTION, ANTI-ARMOUR AND WAR RESERVE STOCKS HAVE BEEN ASSIGNED A PRIORITY COMPATIBLE WITH THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE INTERIM REPORT ON 'BASIC ISSUE' SUBMITTED TO MINISTERS IN DECEMBER, 1973.

(1) MCM-14-74, 18TH FEBRUARY, 1974.

15. WE HAVE TAKEN ACCOUNT, SO FAR AS WE WERE ABLE, OF THE SPECIALISATION STUDIES ALREADY COMPLETED. APART FROM KEEPING IN MIND THE NEED FOR AN OVERALL NATO-WIDE BALANCE OF FORCES ATTEMPTED IN THE COURSE OF THIS REVIEW TO IDENTIFY FURTHER AREAS FOR SPECIALISATION AS SUCH. WE RECOGNISE, HOWEVER, THAT THE FORCE GOALS WE RECOMMEND ARE LIABLE TO ADJUSTMENT BETWEEN NATIONS IN THE LIGHT OF FUTURE STUDIES WITH THE POSSIBILITIES OF SPECIALISATION OF ROLES.

16. ON THE OTHER HAND WE HAVE ATTEMPTED TO IDENTIFY, AS INSTRUCTED, THOSE FORCE GOALS WHICH PROVIDE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR STANDARDISATION OR JOINT PROCUREMENT; WE HAVE ALSO STRESSED THE NEED FOR INTER-OPERABILITY WHERE APPROPRIATE. THESE ARE LISTED IN THE FORCE GOALS FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL COUNTRY. THOSE WHICH SEEM TO USE MOST PROMISING OR IMPORTANT ARE SUMMARISED AT ANNEX. WE HOPE THIS WILL BE OF INTEREST IN CONNECTION WITH ON-GOING STUDIES IN THE CNAD FIELD.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 01868 04 OF 04 042249Z

70

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00

NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 NEA-10

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 ACDA-19 AEC-11 OMB-01 NIC-01 EB-11

DRC-01 /155 W

----- 090207

P R 041900Z APR 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 5029

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 4 OF 4 USNATO 1868

17. IN THE CASE OF THOSE COUNTRIES FOR WHICH THE FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FORCE PROPOSALS IS DEPENDENT LARGELY UPON AID, WE HAVE DEALT WITH THE FEASIBILITY OF PROPOSALS WHICH FALL INTO THE AID CATEGORY ONLY IN THE MOST GENERAL WAY. THE ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY OF THESE PROPOSALS CAN ONLY BE ESTABLISHED BY DETAILED CONSULTATION WITH THE DONOR NATIONS IN THE SPECIAL SUB-GROUP SET UP FOR THIS PURPOSE BY THE EXECUTIVE WORKING GROUP.

ASSOCIATED RISKS

18. THE MILITARY COMMITTEE HAVE POINTED OUT IN THEIR REPORT(1) THAT, AS WAS NOTED IN THE COURSE OF THE 1973 DEFENCE REVIEW(2), A COMPARISON OF THE TRENDS OF CONVENTIONAL FORCES WITH THE QUALITATIVE AND, IN SOME CASES, QUANTITATIVE IMPROVEMENTS OF WARSAW PACT FORCES, THE EXISTING GAP BETWEEN THE CONVENTIONAL CAPABILITIES OF THE WARSAW PACT AND NATO FORCES APPEARS TO BE WIDENING. IN VIEW OF THIS THE MILITARY COMMITTEE CONSIDERS THAT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FORCE PROPOSALS FOR 1975-1980 WHICH IT SUBMITTED ON 18TH FEBRUARY WILL CONSTITUTE SIGNIFICANT
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01868 04 OF 04 042249Z

PROGRESS TOWARDS DIMINISHING THIS APPARENT TREND AND ENHANCING NATO'S CAPABILITY TO MAINTAIN A VARIABLE CONVENTIONAL POSTURE DURING THE TIME PERIOD. THEY MAY WISH AN OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW THIS JUDGEMENT IN RELATION TO THE REVISED FORCE GOALS WHICH THE DEFENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMEND AS ECONOMICALLY FEASIBLE.

-
- (1) MCM-14-74, 18TH FEBRUARY, 1974, PARAGRAPH 20
(2) SEE MCM-83-73, 22ND NOVEMBER, 1973, AND DPC/D(73)23, 30TH NOVEMBER, 1973, GENERAL REPORT, PARAGRAPHS 24 AND 25.
-

CONCLUSIONS

19. THE REVISIONS WHICH WE RECOMMEND TO THE FORCE GOALS FORWARDED BY THE MILITARY COMMITTEE ARE MADE WITH RELUCTANCE AND ON GROUNDS OF TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY ALONE. THEY ARE BOUND TO DETRACT FROM THE MILITARY VALUE OF THE FORCE PLANS APPROVED BY THE MILITARY AUTHORITIES, AND TO UPSET THE BALANCE OF THE INTEGRATED FORCE STRUCTURE THEY HAVE DESIGNED. THEY WILL, IF IMPLEMENTED, PROVIDE LESS SECURITY FOR THE ALLIANCE THAN THOSE WHICH THE MILITARY AUTHORITIES RECOMMEND.

20. WE PROPOSE THESE CHANGES ONLY BECAUSE WE BELIEVE THAT IN THEIR REVISED FORM THEY REPRESENT THE BEST BALANCE BETWEEN MILITARY REQUIREMENTS AND THE RESOURCES LIKELY TO BE AVAILABLE, AND THAT COUNTRIES WILL BE ABLE TO ACCEPT THEM AS A REALISTIC BASIS FOR FORCE PLANNING, AND AS TARGETS WHICH ARE WITHIN THEIR REAL ABILITY TO ACHIEVE. WE HOPE THAT THEY WILL BE ACCEPTED BY NATIONS IN THIS SPIRIT, AND THAT THEY WILL BE ADOPTED BY COUNTRIES AS THE BASIS FOR DECISION AND A STIMULUS TO ACTION IN THE FORCE PLANNING FIELD OVER THE NEXT TWO YEARS. THESE GOALS, IF APPROVED, WILL PROVIDE THE CRITERIA AGAINST WHICH THE MILITARY CONTRIBUTION OF EACH COUNTRY TO THE ALLIANCE WILL BE JUDGED DURING THE NATO DEFENCE REVIEWS OF 1974 AND 1975.

RECOMMENDATIONS

21. THE DEFENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE DEFENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE:

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01868 04 OF 04 042249Z

(A) NOTE THIS REPORT AND THE ASSOCIATED REPORTS FOR EACH COUNTRY;

(B) INVITE THE MILITARY COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER WHETHER THEY WISH TO REVIEW THEIR ASSESSMENT OF ASSOCIATED RISKS;

(C) ADOPT AS NATO FORCE GOALS FOR THE PERIOD 1975-1980 THE QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE PROPOSALS SET OUT IN THE COUNTRY REPORTS AND THEIR ANNEXES(1).

(D) URGE MEMBER COUNTRIES TO SET ACTION IN HAND TO MEET THESE GOALS, AND INVITE THEM TO SUBMIT, WHENEVER POSSIBLE NOT LATER THAN 31ST JULY, 1974, THEIR FORCE AND FINANCIAL PLANS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE NATO FORCE GOALS FOR THE FIVE-YEAR PERIOD TO END 1979;

(E) ((RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING NO-COST/LOW-COST MEASURES, BASIC ISSUES, STANDARDISATION, ETC.))

(F) FORWARD THIS GENERAL REPORT AND THE COUNTRY REPORTS TO MINISTERS FOR THEIR INFORMATION AND AS A BASIS FOR THEIR DISCUSSION ON 14TH JUNE, 1974.

(1) DPC/D(74)5, .. APRIL, 1974, COUNTRY SERIES

END TEXT
RUMSFELD

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 04 APR 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: garlanwa
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO01868
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS 12-31-80
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740482/abbryuer.tel
Line Count: 522
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 10
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: garlanwa
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 09 APR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <09 APR 2002 by elyme>; APPROVED <04-Sep-2002 by garlanwa>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: DRC DISCUSSION OF COVER NOTE FOR 1975-1980 DRAFT FORCE GOALS
TAGS: MCAF, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
USLOSACLANT
CINCLANT
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

